



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

A SYMPOSIUM ON BIBLE-STUDY IN THE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARIES.

II.*

On account of an unusual pressure of work, I can only in the most brief and desultory way suggest what I would say. The general line of thought which you propound is not strange to me. In 1867 I was invited to connect myself with the Theological Seminary in California, and gave the subject much thought, which resulted in some conclusions adverse to the procedures then common in the old seminaries, and in the directions which your questions suggest. In briefest, then, I would reply :

1. I think the great lack of our theological instruction is that it does not sufficiently ground men in the Bible ; that it takes a predetermined system of doctrine into the Scripture to look for support, rather than saturating the mind with Scripture and evolving a theology thence.

2. I believe that the value of *one year* of a course in theology should be spent in seeking to master the substance and spirit of the *English Bible*. Only so can anything like the power as a Biblical preacher which such a man as Moody has, be gained.

3. I should value the illustrative use of Biblical history very far below its value as divinely uttering saving truth. I doubt whether to a generation like ours, Biblical has value over church, or even secular history. The fact that a certain course of conduct has been tried, and with what results, is the pith of history ; and I am not clear that the fact that such results appeared in David's, or Solomon's, life, intensifies its value for popular use over what would be true in the life of Napoleon, or Gordon, or Bismarck.

4. I am uncertain about Hebrew. When men can readily have, and keep, and use, the knowledge of it, it is a great blessing. But it does not seem to me to compare with Greek in *indispensableness* to a minister, and I am by no means clear that for the sake of gaining a smattering of it—to remain that alone—the time would not be much better spent on the English Bible.

5. It is my *impression* that a better thing than to found and fund new chairs of Biblical in distinction from Systematic Theology, would be to *Biblicize* the occupants of the chairs already existing, to that degree that the result would be a theology self-consistent and self-coherent enough to bear being called Systematic, yet so coincident with Scripture in all its lines and angles, that nobody would ever dream of denying it to be Biblical.

HENRY M. DEXTER.

Office of The Congregationalist, Boston, March 12, 1886.

1. My conviction is that the attention paid by seminaries to Bible-study is far from what it ought to be. There is *great need* of “a deeper, broader study of the Bible.”

* No. 1 of this Symposium, containing replies from Lyman Abbott, D. D., A. J. F. Behrends, D. D., Rev. Joseph Cook, Howard Crosby, D. D., LL.D., Wayland Hoyt, D. D., G. W. Lasher, D. D., F. N. Peloubet, D. D., Arthur T. Pierson, D. D., J. A. Smith, D. D., Wm. Hayes Ward, LL.D., appeared in the April number of THE STUDENT.

2. It depends on the range of the study in the original languages. If that is merely critical and exegetical, there could be a profitable study of the Bible in English outside of this—especially in its history, biography, geography, topography, etc., and to learn how, through the progressive revelations of the Old Testament, the way was prepared for the New.

3. By all means, *Bible* history before *Church* history. There is no such book of illustration, in its biographies and narratives, as the Old Testament. It is the only book in which human life and character are photographed *JUST as they are*, without partiality or prejudice. It is *invaluable* on this account. "Higher Criticism," in view of present tendencies, should receive careful attention.

4. Whether a knowledge of Hebrew should be required in order to graduation, I am not ready to say. But its study should certainly be encouraged, and no scholarship should be regarded as complete in its absence.

5. In my judgment, what is called "Systematic Theology" should give place to Biblical Theology. The study of the Bible, and an ascertainment of its truths in their relations to each other, *without regard to any system of theology*, is what is needed. The interpretation of the Bible in the light of any of these systems of theology, I regard as fraught with evil, and tends to the perpetuation of systems and sects of which the Bible knows nothing, except to condemn them.

ISAAC ERRETT.

Office of the Christian Standard, Cincinnati, March 18, 1886.

1. I think the attention paid to Bible-study in our theological seminaries might very profitably be emphasized in many institutions. From what I have learned regarding the real acquaintance with the Bible which the majority of our graduating theological students possess, there is a demand for a deeper, broader study of the divine Word itself.

2. I feel quite confident that great practical good would result from a close study of the Bible in English. Whether such a study would demand a separate department I am hardly prepared to say.

3. Every theological student ought to have a detailed knowledge of *Biblical* history. That is the history upon which he will continually draw for the material and illustrations used in his sermons. He may forget much he has learned of Church history when employed in the active ministry, but he ought not to allow any fact or truth connected with Biblical history to drop from memory.

4. More time might be profitably spent in the study of Hebrew, at least time enough should be devoted to it so that the student could afterwards use it with ease and pleasure.

I think the study of Hebrew should not be required of all divinity students. Many men, from a want of aptitude in the acquisition of languages, might more profitably spend their time in studying the English Bible. They may become efficient pastors even though deficient in linguistic knowledge. I would, however, retain the regular degree of Bachelor of Divinity for those who have successfully pursued the study of Hebrew.

If it could be made practicable, I should think that a knowledge of the principles of the Hebrew language would be a good thing before students enter the seminary. But, unless the study were pursued in the colleges from which the students graduated, I do not see how it would be practicable to *require* this knowledge before they entered the seminary.

5. I think there is ground for the distinction between Biblical theology and Systematic theology. I believe the time will come when a proper division of labor will require the chair of a Professor of Biblical Theology as distinct from that of Systematic Theology.

[Bishop] SAM'L FALLOWS.

Chicago, April 1, 1886.

Pre-eminently the Bible is the minister's hand-book. It is the great mine from which to obtain his materials for doctrine, for instruction, for reproof, for exhortation. As a public teacher it is his business to bring before the people what this book contains. He may draw illustrations, as did the great Teacher, from the world about him, from the fields, the harvests, flowers, birds, the heavens, the common events of daily life, but the Bible itself is the great store-house whose riches he is to unfold. In this book is contained the preaching which God bids men preach (Jonah III., 2), and the message which Jesus commands to be carried into all the world.

These things being true, it follows that beyond comparison the most important part of the minister's equipment is to be sought in the thorough enrichment of his mind and heart with the contents of the Bible itself. This point can scarcely be too strongly emphasized, and a weighty responsibility rests here with those who have the training of ministerial candidates in charge. That the theological seminaries fall sadly short in this matter is strikingly apparent from the average curriculum provided for students. There is an abundance of work mapped out, all of it important and valuable; but singular as it may seem, the one great book, to the minister especially the Book of all books, finds but a limited recognition. It is true that selections are made from the Hebrew of the Old Testament, from the Pentateuch, the historical books, the Psalms and the Prophets, for training in reading and for exegesis, and for like purposes from the Greek of the New Testament. But these are mere fragmentary studies, and the great body of the Bible remains untouched. Should it occasion surprise that frequently graduates from the seminaries, who are understood to have studied theology in its various phases, the Hebrew and Greek languages, biblical interpretation, and many other things important to a good ministerial outfit, are painfully deficient in their knowledge of the Bible in its great fullness?

This knowledge, for the minister who is to preach in the English language, should be acquired in the English Bible. The great value of the Hebrew and the Greek is not to be for a moment underrated, and thoroughness in the study of these languages is greatly to be coveted. But no man can preach to an English congregation in Hebrew or Greek. He cannot even frequently offer a reading different from the common, with the announcement that so it is in the original, without incurring the risk of appearing pedantic. But of the polished shafts of the English Bible he can never have his quiver too full. Even a plain preacher, with but very moderate advantages of culture, whose mind is richly stored with the Bible itself, who like Apollos is "mighty in the Scriptures," will often prove himself among the most effective of men, outstripping frequently the trained men from the seminary, as witness some of the successful evangelists of our time.

The point to be especially emphasized is that the English Bible be made a regular study in the seminaries;—not that it be read simply for devotional purposes, or even for forming a general acquaintance with it;—but that it be studied

systematically and closely as text-books of science are studied in college, with reference to its history, its structure, its contents; and that this study, in recognition of its paramount importance, be continued through the several years of the course, and be conducted with reference to the stated examinations. The potent reason justifying the proposition for such a change in the usual seminary course, lies in the fact that with the Bible more than with all other books the minister should be closely familiar. The rapidly increasing familiarity of the people with the Bible through the agency of the Sunday-schools demands that the minister shall know its contents better—not what interpreters have wrought into elaborate systems of theology, but what the Book itself contains. And he who will most enrich his sermons from the wonderfully fertile fields of the Bible, in its Old and New Covenants, will reach the largest success both as a winner of souls and in instructing his people in the knowledge of divine things.

O. P. GIFFORD.

Boston, Mass.

In what I say I speak, of course, simply from my own personal knowledge of what is being done in our own denominational seminaries. What I say is to be conditioned by the fact that already within the last few years a very perceptible change has begun, as notably in the Philadelphia School and the Cambridge School; which are both full of promise for the future.

1. The attention paid by seminaries to Bible-study does not seem to me sufficiently emphasized for the place assigned the Bible in the Christian Church. They are the exceptions, I think, who leave our seminaries with that real acquaintance with the Bible which they ought to have. As I look back upon my own instruction in seminary years, it seems to me to have been absurdly and preposterously inadequate. Intellectually it was of an order suitable for an average Bible class, and when I began to preach I had, so far as this instruction went, no proper knowledge at all of the books of the Bible. Whatever is or is not taught in the seminary, it seems to me that a thorough knowledge of the biblical books should be given from every possible point of view. As I have conversed during the past few years with students in some of our seminaries, I have been pained to find how little solid advance has been made in the matter of broad, scholarly study of the Bible. Whatever their individual stand-points, it seems to me that all clergymen must unite in the demand for a deeper and broader study of the Bible.

2. It seems to me that perhaps the most important part of Bible-study in the seminary is that which, clearly, can be carried on in English. The whole department of introduction, while, of course, it raises at every point questions as to the original, can yet well be carried on without any extensive knowledge of the original on the part of the student. And this province seems to me by all odds the most important one at present. A man cannot, of course, have a scholarly knowledge of the subject from reading the English Bible alone, but he can have a good general grasp of the subject, which is all-important to put him in the right attitude. It will become him under such conditions to be modest as to detail, but he will be prevented from floundering about in the ridiculous bog in which so many young parsons find themselves up to their neck, without any footing whatever. The leading seminary in our own church, so far as I can learn from its students, has no systematic instruction in the matter of Introductions to the various books of the Bible. If this is at all a sample of what is going on in our seminaries through the land, it is pitiful indeed.

3. I have, I presume, partly answered the queries of this section in what I have just said as to the department of Introduction. Questions of higher criticism should be raised, as it seems to me, in the class-room just so far as they are raised anywhere. I cannot conceive of a thoroughly honest and free class-room where the students do not feel themselves not only at liberty to bring forward any questions of the higher criticism against which they may have run, but encouraged to do so. They will inevitably meet these questions during their seminary years or very quickly after them, if they are going to carry on any home study, and therefore they should meet them squarely in the class-room. I have not the slightest confidence in any system of instruction which dodges difficulties and which makes a bugaboo of any honest department of human inquiry. If the higher criticism is mistaken it must needs be refuted; if it is correct anywhere, its correctness must be granted. Whether right or wrong, its questions must be met as freely as they are raised anywhere in the walks of scholarship.

4. I shall probably put myself down amongst the Philistines in honestly answering the questions of this section. I should say that the desirability of any thorough mastery of the Hebrew depends upon what province of clerical labor a man is looking forward to. Abstractly, of course, every clergyman ought to be at home in the original tongue of the Old Testament. Practically, the parish parson and the preacher will find little time to continue those careful studies in the Hebrew which alone will yield him solid fruit, while he will find ready at hand for him, in the labors of trained scholars, more than all the most valuable fruit which he could have laboriously mastered for himself. I should say that every student should be sufficiently at home in Hebrew, as in Greek, to enable him to judge between the renderings of different scholars, but that for the average parson, engaged in parish duties and in preaching, his intellectual leisure can be put into more fruitful fields than the minutiae of Hebrew scholarship.

R. HEBER NEWTON.

Garden City, Long Island, March 15, 1886.

1. I have long been convinced that "Bible-study in the strict sense of the term" has not been sufficiently emphasized by our seminaries. I fear that too many young ministers, at graduation, know less of the English Bible, and how to use it, than some men otherwise uneducated, who have made it the subject of special, constant and reverent study. There are seminary students who know all about the great heresies of church history, and the dogmatic and philosophical differences between the great schools of theology, adepts in Greek, Hebrew and patristic lore, who might stand abashed before some plain expounder of the Word, thoroughly familiar with its text and spirit. We do not desire our students to know less of the former, but more of the latter.

2. A special study of the English Bible in our seminaries will have the good result of making the preacher familiar with his one "Text-book." To do the Bible-work well in the homes of his people, he must make this Book his "Vade-mecum." Many of us have been hampered all through our ministry by starting out with too little knowledge of it. I should hail heartily any movement to inaugurate in our seminaries a separate department for its particular study. We cannot overestimate its importance.

3. We should give more attention than we do to the examination of our candidates for the ministry, in Biblical History. Their average ignorance on this

subject is astonishing and lamentable—knowing comparatively little of the correspondence between the prophetic and historical portions of the Old Testament, or of the relation of the Psalter to the life of David, and the books of Samuel, Kings and Chronicles. Looking upon these books as a part of Church History, I regard them as of the greatest value in “furnishing material for illustration.” Any man with an illustrative talent, and with a memory stored with the facts of sacred history, has an inexhaustible mine, for the lack of which no familiarity with profane history, or modern literature, can compensate him.

4. Too little, not too much, time has been given to Hebrew; but it has not been used always in the right place. I advocate the mastery of the fundamentals in Hebrew before entering the seminary. It would be a grand thing if every candidate for seminary instruction could take at least one term in the Hebrew Summer Schools, or such instruction as would be equivalent to it, before commencing his theological studies. I would then discriminate between gifts—demanding of those who have gifts to preach and no linguistic talent, nothing further in the Hebrew than these fundamental principles, giving them more time in the seminary for the thorough and practical study of the English Bible; while they who have the “gift of tongues,” and desire to master this “Holy Tongue,” may press their way to the “last things” in such study, using their pre-seminary knowledge of the language as a firm ground for such advanced studies, securing thus, at the same time, more time for the most thorough acquaintance with and study of the English Bible.

5. I believe that there is very strong ground for the “distinction now coming to be made.” It is of the greatest practical importance. Let it have a distinct department, with a separate Professor, as familiar with the Bible as Moody and his followers, and who knows, as they do, how to handle and make use of the Word. We ought to combine such knowledge of and power with the Bible with the culture of the schools. If we could not do so, and if it were necessary to sacrifice the one to the other,—which I do not believe,—let us give up the latter and cling to the former. We can have both. Certainly our ministry furnishes us noble examples of such combination.

C. E. ROBINSON,

Rochester, N. Y.

1. I do not know how it is now, but, judging from my own experience in the theological seminary twenty years ago, I should most decidedly say that the attention paid by seminaries to the direct study of the Scriptures is not sufficiently emphasized. If I remember rightly, our exegetical studies comprised the critical examination of only a few chapters in the Greek New Testament, the reading of a portion of the Book of Genesis in Hebrew, and the hasty examination of the Chaldee of the Book of Daniel. So much time was given to the study of Systematic Theology, Church History and Homiletics, that comparatively little was left for a broad and thorough examination of the Word of God. If the same rules hold in our seminaries now, I should say that the demand for a closer and profounder study of the Bible, especially—since just now it is the special object of attack—the Old Testament, is well grounded.

2. For a certain class of students the study of the Bible in English seems to me very desirable and helpful. I think, of course, that as far as possible students should give their attention to the Bible in the original tongues. Until they do

this they will never secure the full meaning of the Inspired Word. Still it seems to me to be wise to provide those who have never had the opportunity to make themselves acquainted with the Greek and Hebrew, but who nevertheless feel themselves called to preach the Gospel, a course of study in English. The creation of a special department for such study should be determined, I think, by circumstances. There are parts of the country where such a department is a great necessity.

3. By all means, I should say, greater attention should be given to the study of Biblical History and Literature. Every young man coming into the ministry should certainly know, and be able to give, the facts pertaining to the critical study of his great text-book. Surely also he should be familiar with the historical setting of its various books, and the circumstances attending and often conditioning its utterances. Without such knowledge no man can preach as he ought. All questions affecting the integrity of the Sacred Word, either as a whole, or, in any of its parts, should be considered in the class-room. As for illustrations from Biblical History, Geikie has shown in his *Hours with the Bible* that the most valuable ones that a minister can employ may be found in the text itself and its associations. For general use biblical illustrations are always by all odds the most valuable.

4. The study of Hebrew should, in my judgment, form part of the curriculum required for regular graduation, and sufficient time should be given to it to enable the student to read fairly well any portion of the Old Testament. Ordinarily, I fear, about enough Hebrew is taught to last the young pastor two or three years after leaving the seminary. It would be well if the study of Hebrew was begun before the student enters the seminary, but with our present college term, and other difficulties in the way, I do not see how this is practicable. The better plan, I think, is not to require a previous knowledge of Hebrew, but to extend its study in the seminary. Perhaps, after a while, our seminaries may advance to a four years course, and there would then be ample time.

5. I have never been able to see any valid reason for a distinction between Biblical and Systematic Theology. If Systematic Theology is not thoroughly biblical, in both its statements and its methods, the sooner it is gotten rid of the better. There is, of course, a sense in which the term Biblical Theology may be used in distinction from that of Systematic Theology, but such comparison of book with book, or part with part, as is involved in such a conception, may and should be referred to the department of Exegesis. The creation of two theological chairs in the same school would lead, I should think, to inevitable difficulty and confusion.

A. J. ROWLAND.

Baltimore, March 18, 1886.

1. It is my opinion that Bible-study is not sufficiently emphasized in our seminaries; and that men do not leave the seminary with that knowledge of the Bible which they ought to have. It is certainly true that the demand for a deeper, broader study of the Bible is well grounded.

2. I believe that the study of the Bible in English in the seminary would be attended with good results; and this work seems to be of such importance as to make a separate department for it desirable.

3. Sufficient attention is not given to the study of biblical literature and history, which certainly deserves as much study as is accorded to church history. How far questions of higher criticism ought to be considered in the class-room depends upon the scholar and the teacher. Biblical history is of the very greatest value in furnishing material, and for illustration; for when you talk about the Bible, the people know what you are talking about. They do not know when you speak of the Patripassionists of such a century.

4. Some men spend too much time on Hebrew; others, too little. Everything depends upon the man. The study of Hebrew should certainly be recommended to all divinity students. I am not inclined to think that a knowledge of it ought to be required in all cases for graduation.

5. I think there is ground for a distinction between Biblical Theology and Systematic Theology. The former department is one of great importance, and why may it not be taught as a part of Exegesis.

Permit me to add that I have heard my father quote from Prof. Moses Stuart his desire to see a seminary where the instruction should be wholly biblical, wholly devoted to teaching the Bible.

H. L. WAYLAND.

Office of the National Baptist, Philadelphia, March 15, 1886.

1. "Is Bible study emphasized sufficiently?" What amount of emphasizing would entitle us to say that? Very strongly emphasized, it undoubtedly is.

To the question whether men leave the seminary with that knowledge of the Bible which they ought to have, I would say emphatically, No. But this may not be the fault of seminaries. It is quite as likely, it is far more likely, to be the fault or the misfortune of early education. The preacher's mind should be saturated with the Bible. But this result could not come from a three years' seminary course. It needs years and years of habitual familiarity with the book. Whatever "demand" really exists, and a great deal more than really exists, might find ample ground in the existing *need*.

2. Well conducted, the study of the English Bible in the seminary would unquestionably be attended with good results. There are kinds of work which can be done as well from the English Bible, as from the Bible in the original languages, and indeed far better. Porson, the greatest Greek scholar of modern times, was not ashamed to admit that he read authors in English more easily than he could in Greek. For extensive and comprehensive reading and study of the Bible as a whole, or of books of the Bible as wholes, nay, even of considerable passages in books, the English form is, for any English student, however well versed in the original tongue, better than the Greek or the Hebrew.

As to separation of departments, there is room for difference of opinion. It deserves to be deeply considered whether it would not tend to produce better results, in several very important respects, to have the heads of the departments usually existing distribute among themselves the work of teaching the Bible in English. I myself should strongly favor this plan over any other.

3. Biblical Literature may fairly be considered to derive all its real importance from the illustrative light that it throws on the Bible itself. It is a means, a method, of biblical study—therefore, kept duly subordinate, very helpful. Biblical History is itself Bible, and therefore this question has already been answered. As to the so-called "higher criticism"—this also, properly conceived, is

an instrument of studying the Bible. Use it, but do not abuse it. Biblical History, as a source of homiletic illustration, is, generally speaking, *more* valuable than Church History, or any history not in the Bible, according as it is better known to average hearers than other history. There are cases, however, in which novelty of illustration is better than familiarity.

4. Both too much and too little time is given to the study of Hebrew. Too much, in the case of students who will never learn it—too little, in the case of students who might learn it well. All divinity students should not be required to study it, but for full graduation it should be demanded. I would have the seminary organized in schools or sections, with right of graduation in each independently.

Preparation in Hebrew before entering the seminary might often be required to advantage, not always. In the case of students desiring to make Hebrew a specialty, it would be well; but in the case of others, such a plan would be doubtful, in view of what besides must be required.

5. There is ground for the distinction between Biblical and Systematic theology—but this is so much the worse for Systematic theology. There is no other department in theology, aside from that of Biblical theology, that has of right the half of one good leg to stand on. Theology ought to be “Biblical,” at all hazards, and “Systematic” only as the teacher can make it so in consistency with that first condition. I suspect that God is the sole Systematic Theologian in the universe. We cannot systematize knowledge very successfully, when our knowledge at best consists but of a few infinitesimal fragments, disjointed at that, of all there is to be known. “Our little systems have their day.”

W. C. WILKINSON.

Tarrytown, N. Y., April 1, 1886.

I cannot answer the questions *seriatim*, and I know too little of theological seminaries generally, to speak with any confidence regarding them. But the danger in all such institutions is to put the means in the place of the end; and to send out specialists, in one department or another, rather than preachers. We need good and great Hebrew and Greek scholars, but these must be exceptional, and any system of training which would shunt young men out of the main line that leads to the pulpit, into a siding of mere scholarship—making it their ambition to be professors, rather than to be preachers of the Gospel, is greatly to be deprecated. I confess that when I see, as I sometimes have seen, a young man who would make, just as he is, an excellent and useful minister, starting for Europe to study Hebrew, or Syriac, or Arabic, or Assyrian, that he may come home and settle down into a professor, I am a good deal saddened. The church wants *preachers*. Of course it needs professors too, but it needs preachers just now far more than it does professors, and I feel that the *end* should be exalted in all our seminaries far more than the *means* towards its attainment. We blame rich men sometimes for making that which ought to be a means into an end, but in this particular I fear we are guilty of the same folly.

As to having a Professorship of Biblical Theology my mind has undergone somewhat of a change. Ten years ago I would have approved of such a course, without any qualification, but I am not so sure about it now. Systematic Theology must be the outcome of any Biblical Theology, and now I think I would pre-

fer to have the Professors of Systematic Theology proceed by the method of Biblical Induction.

As to the study of the English Bible, I do not know that I would make that a distinct part of a seminary course, but a very thorough knowledge of the English Bible should in my judgment be required for entrance into a theological seminary. It may be that an entrance examination on that subject would exclude many who now apply; but that would be the case only for a little while, since the demand for such knowledge as a preliminary, would lead to more attention being given to it by those who are desirous of gaining admission to the seminary. But such biblical knowledge is indispensable, and whether it be insisted on for entrance, or taught in a separate class, it must not be neglected, as I fear it is too much.

WM. M. TAYLOR.

New York City, April 14, 1886.

THE BIBLICAL CREATION.

BY PROF. M. S. TERRY, S. T. D.,

Garrett Biblical Institute, Evanston, Ill.

It seems presumptuous to add another word to a literature so voluminous as that of "Biblical Cosmogony." We assume that the readers of this journal are familiar with the various theories which have been employed to "reconcile Genesis and Geology," and we will spend no time to state them or discuss them here. A faithful application of the principles of grammatico-historical interpretation would rule out most of the current expositions, particularly those which make it their special aim to harmonize the biblical narrative with the results of modern science. One of the ablest and most popular efforts of this kind is that of the late Prof. Guyot, whose work on *Creation; or The Biblical Cosmogony in the Light of Modern Science* (New York, 1884) affirms that the "days" of Genesis 1. were vast cosmogonic ages, and are not to be regarded so much as periods of time as "organic phases of Creation." He holds that the word *earth* in Gen. 1., 2, means "the primordial cosmic material out of which God was going to organize the heavens and the earth." He also maintains that in the first two chapters of Genesis the word *day* is employed in five different meanings. Such liberties with simple words would seem to set at naught all established laws of exegesis.

Sound grammatico-historical interpretation requires that we explain words according to their common usage, put ourselves as nearly as possible into the position of the writer, and ascertain the ideas he expresses precisely as they lay in his mind. To transfer into the language of an ancient author the ideas of a later age, and torture his words in order to make them fit modern notions, is not exposition but imposition.

The grammatico-historical method of exposition is fairly followed by those who adopt what is quite commonly known as the Chalmerian hypothesis, or renovation theory. This hypothesis supposes the first verse of Genesis to state the primordial creation of the universe, but between the first and the second verse (some say, the first and the third) it allows indefinite ages for the geological development of the earth. It assumes that immediately before the introduction of